

EXHIBIT A

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

IN RE NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION)	MDL No. 2804
OPIATE LITIGATION)	
)	CASE NO. 1:17-MD-2804
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:)	
)	JUDGE DAN AARON POLSTER
<i>Track Three Cases</i>)	
)	
<i>County of Lake, Ohio v.</i>)	
<i>Walgreen Co., et al.,</i>)	
<i>Case No. 18-OP-45032</i>)	<u>JURY VOIR DIRE</u>
)	
<i>County of Trumbull, Ohio v.</i>)	
<i>Walgreen Co., et al.,</i>)	
<i>Case No. 18-OP-45079</i>)	

NEUTRAL STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Thank you all for being here today. Before I ask you questions, I want to tell you a little bit about this case. The Plaintiffs in this case are Lake County and Trumbull County. There are four Defendants, all of which are national and regional pharmacy chains. The Defendants are: (1) Walmart, (2) Walgreens, (3) CVS, and (4) HBC Giant Eagle.

The four Pharmacy Defendants each bought prescription opioids from pharmaceutical manufacturers and then distributed those prescription opioids to their pharmacy stores or bought and received prescription opioids from other distributors. The pharmacy stores then used these opioids to fill prescriptions for patients written by doctors and other healthcare practitioners.

The Pharmacy Defendants each played two related roles during their business dealings with prescription opioids – one as distributor and one as dispenser. First, they acted as a distributor when they bought opioids from manufacturers and then distributed the drugs to their pharmacy stores. Second, they acted as a dispenser when their pharmacy stores filled prescriptions for patients.

The two Counties allege the Pharmacy Defendants failed to monitor, detect, investigate, report, and stop certain suspicious shipments and illegitimate prescriptions of opioids, which

allowed the opioids to be diverted to illegal use. The Counties allege these suspicious shipments and illegitimate prescriptions caused a public nuisance, which is defined as a substantial interference with the public health in their Counties.

The Pharmacy Defendants deny the Counties' claims that they caused a public nuisance. The Defendants contend that they complied with their legal obligations, violated no duties, and did not cause a substantial interference with the public health in the two Counties.